

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

The attached replacement sheet of drawings includes changes to FIG. 1, and replaces the original sheet including FIG. 1.

FIG. 1 has been amended to include a “Prior Art” designation. No new matter has been added.

Replacement Sheets (1 page)

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-27 are pending in the application. Claim 10 has been amended. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

### **I. Drawings**

The drawings were objected to under 37 CFR 1.121(d). In particular, the Examiner noted that FIG. 1 should be designated by a legend such as – Prior Art – because only that which is old is illustrated.

Applicant has amended the drawings to include a Prior Art designation. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objections to the drawings.

### **II. The § 102/103 Rejections**

Claims 1-2, 7, 10-11, 16, 19-20 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2002/0080759 (“Harrington”).

Claims 3, 12 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harrington in view of U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2003/0148775 (“Spriestersbach”).

Claims 4, 13 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harrington in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,798,376 (“Shioda”).

Claims 5-6, 9, 14-15, 18, 23-24 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harrington and Shioda in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,597,915 (“Shi”).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Claim 1 recites a method for validating access point locations in a wireless network. The method includes performing a scan by a validating access point to detect and locate at least one access point in the wireless network, and utilizing location data of at least one detected access

point, in the validating access point, to direct self-correction of current location data of the validating access point.

*A. Harrington Fails To Disclose a Validating Access Point Utilizing Location Data of at Least One Detected Access Point To Direct Self-Correction of Current Location Data of the Validating Access Point*

Harrington discloses a wireless local area network system that can determine a position of a mobile access point (see Abstract). In particular, Harrington's system includes a plurality of access point stations 20 at known locations, and a mobile access point station 22 located at an unknown position. The mobile access point station 22 transmits communication signals within the wireless network system, and a location processor 24 (that is connected to each of the access point stations 20) processes the communication signals received from the mobile access point station 22 to determine a location of the mobile access point station 22 (paragraph 0021; FIG. 1).

While Harrington discloses determining a location of a mobile access point, Harrington fails to disclose utilizing location data of at least one detected access point in the validating access point to direct *self-correction* of current location data of the validating access point. That is, Harrington's mobile access point station 22, *itself*, does not use location data of any one of the plurality of access point stations 20 to determine its location. Instead, in Harrington's system, a location processor 24 (located outside and independent of the mobile access point station 22) determines location of the mobile access point station 22 based on the locations of the plurality of access point stations 20. Moreover, because Harrington's system relies on the location processor 24 to determine a location of the mobile access station 24, the mobile access point station 24 cannot self-correct location data of itself, as required by claim 1. Consequently, Harrington fails to disclose utilizing location data of at least one detected access point in the validating access

point to direct self-correction of current location data of the validating access point, as recited in claim 1.

For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that claim 1, and the claims that depend therefrom, are in condition for allowance.

*B. Other Independent Claims*

Claims 10 and 19 incorporate limitations similar to those of claim 1. Claims 10 and 19 (and the claims that depend therefrom) are also allowable over Harrington for reasons corresponding to those set forth with respect to claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claims 1-27 are allowable over the cited references, and are in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, the Examiner is invited to call Applicant's attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,  
SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP



Kelvin M. Vivian  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 53,727  
(650) 493-4540

January 9, 2006

Date